# CHAPTER 3 CDBG PROGRAM CONSOLIDATED PLAN HOUSING DATA

This document provides data (in addition to the data provided on Housing in Chapter 2 of this technical appendix) in support of the Consolidated Plan for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program for the City of Sandy Springs, Georgia. The City anticipates qualifying for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) CDBG Program in January 2008. In order to assess the needs of the community, Sandy Springs' comprehensive planning consultant compiled 2000 Census data for the Sandy Springs Census Designated Place (CDP), a unit of geography substantially similar if not identical to the city limits as they were established upon its incorporation as a city on December 1, 2005. In addition, citizens, community groups, non-profit and for-profit organizations, social service agencies and housing agencies were consulted in the data collection and assessment process.

# AREA MEDIAN INCOME (AMI) LEVELS

Table 3.1 provides the Area Median Income (AMI) for the year 2000 for the Atlanta Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Table 1 also shows the income figures for extremely low-income (30% AMI), low-income (50% AMI), and moderate-income (80% AMI) households in the Atlanta MSA. These household incomes figures are used to group data into the three income analysis categories.

Table 3.1
Area Median Income (AMI), 2000
Atlanta Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

Area Median Income (AMI) Category	% of AMI	Income (\$)
Area Median Income in Atlanta MSA (AMI)	100% AMI	\$51,948
Extremely low income	30% AMI	\$15,584
Low income	50% AMI	\$25,974
Moderate income	80% AMI	\$41,558

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census for Atlanta MSA. Note: Data are for households.

#### HOUSEHOLDS BY AREA MEDIAN INCOME (AMI) CATEGORY IN 2000

Table 3.2 shows the total number of households in the Sandy Springs Census Designated Place (CDP) in 2000, disaggregated by income categories which approximate the AMI categories. Comparing income figures in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 reveals that there is not an exact match between census-reported income ranges and AMI incomes for the Atlanta MSA. However, the two are close enough to provide reliable data.

As shown in Table 3.2, 2,995 households, or 7.6% of all households in the Sandy Springs CDP in 2000, can be classified as extremely low income households. A similar number, 2,803, can be classified as low income households (7.2% of all households in the CDP/city). There were 6,091 households, or 15.5% of all households, that can be classified as moderate income in 2000 in Sandy Springs. This means there were 11,889 households in Sandy Springs in 2000 which were the "target" households in terms of Area Median Income (AMI) thresholds. In other words, that is the number of households in 2000 which met (fall within) the 30%, 50%, and 80%

AMI categories in 2000. The target population of 80% AMI or lower in 2000, constituted 30.3% of all households in Sandy Springs in 2000. For purposes of this analysis, the middle and higher income households (i.e., more than 80% of AMI) are excluded from further analysis in this report, except as may be specifically noted elsewhere in this report.

Table 3.2
Households by Area Median Income (AMI) Category in 2000
Sandy Springs CDP

AMI Category	Income Range Approximating AMI Category	Number of Households	Percentage of Total Households
Extremely Low Income	Less than \$14,999	2,995	7.6%
Low Income	\$15,000 to \$24,999	2,803	7.2%
Moderate Income	\$25,000 to \$39,999	6,091	15.5%
Middle to Higher Income	\$40,000 or more	27,293	69.7%
Total All Households		39,182	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Table P52.

#### **CURRENT AND PROJECTED HOUSEHOLD ESTIMATES**

As a part of the comprehensive planning process, Sandy Springs' planning consultants have estimated the current number of households and projected the future number of households in the City. Such estimates and projections are based on various sources of data, including recent estimates of housing units in Sandy Springs by the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC). Those estimates and projections of households are provided in Table 3.3. Note that the household estimates and projections are based on housing unit estimates and projections, assuming an overall 5 percent vacancy rate.

Table 3.3
Estimates and Projections of Total Households
City of Sandy Springs, 2005-2012

City of Sandy Springs	2005	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012
Total Households	42,190	42,318	42,434	42,551	42,951	43,007

Source: Jerry Weitz & Associates, Inc. September 2006.

Since there are no data for current years nor projections of households by income categories, one must make assumptions. Absent other reliable data, it is reasonable to assume that the year 2000 income distribution is the same for the current year (2006) and will remain the same in the short term future planning period (year 2011).

Table 3.4 provides estimates and projections of households by Area Median Income (AMI) category, assuming the year 2000 (census) distribution remains valid. The "target" households in terms of Area Median Income (AMI) thresholds will increase from 11,889 households in Sandy Springs in 2000 to 13,027 in the year 2012, an increase of 1,138. During the next five years (2007-2012), the target households (80% or lower of AMI in 2000) will increase by 573.

Table 3.4
Estimates and Projections of Households
By Area Median Income (AMI) Category
City of Sandy Springs, 2005-2012

City of Sandy Springs	2005	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012
Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)	3,223	3,233	3,242	3,251	3,281	3,286
Low Income (50% AMI)	3,016	3,025	3,034	3,042	3,071	3,075
Moderate Income (80% AMI)	6,539	6,559	6,577	6,595	6,657	6,666
All Target Households (0-80%	12,778	12,817	12,853	12,888	13,009	13,027
AMI)						
Total Households in City	42,190	42,318	42,434	42,551	42,951	43,007

Source: Jerry Weitz & Associates, Inc. October 2006.

# FAMILY TYPE BY AREA MEDIAN INCOME (AMI) CATEGORY IN 2000

In 2000, Sandy Springs had 19,962 "family" households and 19,220 "non-family" households (Census 2000, SF 3, Table P13). Table 3.5 provides data for family households only. Specifically, Table 5 shows families by type of family household (single mother, single father, and married couple) by AMI income category for Sandy Springs in 2000.

Table 3.5
Family Type by Area Median Income (AMI) Category, 2000
Sandy Springs CDP

AMI Category	Single Mother		Single	Father	Married Couple	
Aivii Category	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Extremely Low						
Income	308	21.1%	31	9.4%	382	2.4%
(Less than \$14,999)						
Low Income	228	15.6%	43	13.0%	673	4.2%
(\$15,000 to \$24,999)	220	15.0 /6	43	13.0 //	0/3	4.2 /0
Moderate Income	414	28.3%	90	27.3%	1,257	7.8%
(\$25,000 to \$39,999)	414	20.576	90	21.570	1,237	7.076
All Target Families	950	65.0%	164	49.7%	2,312	14.4%
(0-80% AMI)	930	05.076	104	43.7 /0	2,312	14.4 /0
Total Families City	1,461	100%	330	100%	16,095	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, SF3, Table PCT38

The data in Table 3.5 help demonstrate what is already anticipated – married couple families are less represented in the AMI income categories. Only 14.4% of all married-couple families have incomes at or below 80% AMI. Female-headed households (single mother) are the most heavily represented in the AMI income categories. Approximately two-thirds of all single-mother families are target households (i.e., 80% or less AMI). Approximately one-half (49.7%) of single-father families fall within the 80% or lower AMI target household category. Married couple families, while smaller on a percentage basis than single-parent families, are significantly larger in numbers, however. That suggests that although single-mother-headed families are

more susceptible to lower (qualifying) incomes, the need in terms of total numbers of affordable housing units serving married couple families is more than twice that of the need for housing for single-parent (single mother and single father) families, as of 2000 in Sandy Springs.

There were 741 "large" (i.e., six persons or more) households in the Sandy Springs CDP in 2000, comprising 1.9% of all households in the CDP in 2000. Census data do not crosstabulate household income data by household size.

#### TENURE BY AREA MEDIAN INCOME (AMI) CATEGORY IN 2000

Tenure refers to owner versus renter households. Table 3.6 cross-tabulates owner and renter households by AMI categories. Approximately one-fourth (24%) of all owner households in Sandy Springs in 2000 can be classified as having an income 80% or lower of the AMI. On the other hand, more than one-half of all renter households have incomes 80% or lower of the AMI. Renters comprised almost three-quarters (73.4%) of the households at or below 80% AMI in Sandy Springs in 2000.

Table 3.6
Tenure by Area Median Income (AMI) Category, 2000
Sandy Springs CDP

AMI Category	Owner Households		Renter Ho	useholds	All Households	
Aivii Category	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Extremely Low Income (Less than \$14,999)	749	4.2%	2,362	11.1%	3,111	7.9%
Low Income (\$15,000 to \$24,999)	759	4.2%	2,079	9.7%	2,838	7.2%
Moderate Income (\$25,000 to \$49,999)	2,790	15.6%	7,407	34.7%	10,197	26.0%
All Target Households (0-80% AMI)	4,298	24.0%	11,848	54.2%	16,146	41.1%
Total Households	17,887	100%	21,332	100%	39,219	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Table HCT11

## **ELDERLY BY AREA MEDIAN INCOME (AMI) CATEGORY IN 2000**

Elderly householders are those 65 years old or more. Table 7 cross-tabulates elderly households (householder 65 years or more) by AMI income category.

Of the total 5,511 elderly households in Sandy Springs in 2000, approximately one-half (50.3%) were at or below 80% of the Atlanta MSA AMI. The elderly households were nearly evenly distributed among extremely low, low, and moderate incomes, with 17%, 14%, and 19% respectively, as shown in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7
Elderly Households by Area Median Income (AMI) Category, 2000
Sandy Springs CDP

AMI Category	Number of Elderly Households	% of All Elderly Households
Extremely Low Income (Less than \$14,999)	961	17.4%
Low Income (\$15,000 to \$24,999)	759	13.8%
Moderate Income (\$25,000 to \$39,999)	1,052	19.1%
All Target Elderly Households (0-80% AMI)	2,772	50.3%
Total Elderly Households	5,511	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Table P55.

# NONFAMILY HOUSEHOLDS BY AREA MEDIAN INCOME (AMI) CATEGORY IN 2000

Census data do not cross-tabulate household income data by household size. However, Table 3.8 shows non-family households by AMI in 2000 in Sandy Springs. There were 8,185 non-family households in Sandy Springs in 2000 which had incomes at or below 80% of the AMI in 1999, constituting 42.6% of all non-family households in the city (Census Designated Place) in 2000.

Table 3.8
Non-family Households by Area Median Income (AMI) Category, 2000
Sandy Springs CDP

AMI Category	Number of Non-family Households	% of All Non-family Households
Extremely Low Income (Less than \$14,999)	2,243	11.6%
Low Income (\$15,000 to \$24,999)	1,759	9.2%
Moderate Income (\$25,000 to \$39,999)	4,183	21.8%
All Target Non-family Households (0-80% AMI)	8,185	42.6%
Total Non-family Households	19,220	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Table P79.

#### RACE AND ETHNIC ORIGIN BY AREA MEDIAN INCOME (AMI) CATEGORY IN 2000

Table 3.9 provides AMI data by race/ethnic origin for households in Sandy Springs in 2000. Of the 11,730 households shown in Table 9 which had incomes at or below 80% AMI in 1999, the vast majority (75.7%) were White households. Black households comprised 16.9% of total households meeting the 80% or lower AMI threshold in 2000, while households of Hispanic or Latino ethnic origin (of any race) comprised 7.4% of total households in 2000. This means that the greatest need in terms of absolute numbers of households is that of White households.

However, as shown in Table 3.9, there are disproportionate needs in terms of Black and Hispanic/Latino households. As noted previously, 30.3% of all households in Sandy Springs in

2000 had incomes in 1999 at or below 80% AMI. Hence, that is the benchmark for purposes of determining whether there are disproportionate needs based on race or ethnic origin.

Whereas 28% of all white households had incomes in 1999 at or below the 80% AMI threshold (below the benchmark), Black and Hispanic/Latino households had significantly higher percentages (well above the benchmark), at 43.3% and 42.0%, respectively. Also, in terms of extremely low household incomes in 1999, Hispanic/Latino households were disproportionately represented as of 2000. Almost 12% of all Hispanic/Latino households in 2000 were at or below the 30% AMI threshold (i.e., extremely low income).

Table 3.9
Households by Race/Ethnicity by Area Median Income (AMI) Category, 2000
Sandy Springs CDP

AMI Category	Black		Hispanic	or Latino	White	
Aivii Category	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Extremely Low Income (Less than \$14,999)	359	7.8%	244	11.8%	2,314	7.3%
Low Income (\$15,000 to \$24,999)	583	12.8%	279	13.5%	1,958	6.2%
Moderate Income (\$25,000 to \$39,999)	1,039	22.7%	345	16.7%	4,609	14.5%
All Target Households in Race/Ethic Category	1,981	43.3%	868	42.0%	8,881	28.0%
Total All Households	4,568	100%	2,064	100%	31,799	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Tables P151A, P151B, and P151H.

Table 3.10

Race/Ethnicity of Elderly Households by Area Median Income (AMI) Category, 2000

Sandy Springs CDP

AMI Category	Black Elderly			c/Latino erly	White Elderly	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Extremely Low Income (Less than \$14,999)	18	26.5%	23	31.9%	912	17.0%
Low Income (\$15,000 to \$24,999)	22	32.4%	20	27.8%	719	13.4%
Moderate Income (\$25,000 to \$39,999)	14	20.6%	10	13.9%	1,031	19.3%
All Elderly Target Households in Race/Ethnic Category	54	79.4%	53	73.6%	2,662	49.8%
Total Elderly Households	68	100%	72	100%	5,349	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Table PCT72A, PCT72B, PCT72H

Table 3.10 provides income data cross-tabulated for elderly households by race and ethnic origin. The numbers of White elderly households far outweighed Black and Hispanic/Latino households in Sandy Springs in 2000. For White elderly households in Sandy Springs in 2000, approximately one-half (49.2%) had incomes in 1999 at or below the 80% AMI. Black and Hispanic/Latino elderly households were disproportionately higher, at 79.4% and 73.6% of all households in that race or ethnic origin category, respectively.

#### PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

The U.S. Census Bureau compiles statistics for persons with disabilities, but cross-tabulations by income are not provided. Table 3.11 provides data on the various types of disabilities by age group. Mental disabilities are the greatest concern for persons ages 5 to 15 years in 2000, while physical disabilities are the greatest concern among elderly persons as of 2000 in Sandy Springs.

Table 3.11
Persons by Type of Disability by Age Group, 2000
Sandy Springs CDP

Type of Disability	5 to 15 years	%	15 to 64 years	%	65 years and over	%	All Age Groups	%
Sensory Disability	24	0.1%	623	6.0%	1,054	16.4%	1,701	9.8%
Physical Disability	87	18.7%	1,421	13.6%	2,107	32.8%	3,615	20.9%
Mental Disability	276	59.4%	991	9.5%	810	12.6%	2,077	12.0%
Self-Care Disability	78	16.8%	365	3.5%	845	13.2%	1,288	7.4%
Go-outside- home Disability	0	0%	1,899	18.2%	1,602	25.0%	3,501	20.2%
Employment Disability			5,145	49.3%			5,145	29.7%
Total	465	100%	10,444	100%	6,418	100%	17,327	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Table P41.

The Census Bureau defines "disability" as follows: "A long-lasting physical, mental, or emotional condition. This condition can make it difficult for a person to do activities such as walking, climbing stairs, dressing, bathing, learning, or remembering. This condition can also impede a person from being able to go outside the home alone or to work at a job or business."

Table 3.12 provides data on disabilities for elderly households by race/ethnicity. There are no discernible patterns shown in the data provided in Table 3.12, except that White elderly households appeared to be more susceptible to physical disabilities when compared with Black and Hispanic/Latino elderly households in 2000. Also, although small in terms of absolute terms, Hispanic/Latino elderly households in 2000 were more likely to have mental disabilities than White or Black elderly households in 2000.

Table 3.12

Types of Disabilities of Elderly Household by Race/Ethnicity, 2000

Sandy Springs CDP

Type of Disability	Black Elderly			or Latino erly	White Elderly	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Sensory Disability	19	12.7%	7	9.9%	1,024	16.7%
Physical Disability	37	24.7%	16	22.5%	2,035	33.1%
Mental Disability	24	16.0%	16	22.5%	779	12.7%
Self-Care Disability	21	14.0%	7	9.9%	798	13.0%
Go-outside-home Disability	49	32.7%	25	35.2%	1,511	24.6%
Total	150	100%	71	100%	6,147	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Table PCT67A.

#### **PERSONS WITH HIV/AIDS**

The U.S. Census Bureau does not report data on HIV/AIDS as a part of the decennial census. However, data are available for total reported AIDS cases in the metropolitan Atlanta area during the past decade, as shown in Table 3.13. It cannot be determined how many of these reported cases of AIDS were for persons residing in Sandy Springs.

Table 3.13
Reported AIDS cases, by Ryan White CARE Act in Atlanta Eligible Metropolitan Area,<sup>1</sup>
July 1995 through June 2005

Time Period	Reported Cases
7/1995 to 6/1996	1,646
7/1996 to 6/1997	1,311
7/1997 to 6/1998	875
7/1998 to 6/1999	1,009
7/1999 to 6/2000	674
7/2000 to 6/2001	841
7/2001 to 6/2002	1,178
7/2002 to 6/2003	934
7/2003 to 6/2004	1,177
7/2004 to 6/2005	1,287
Total	10,932

Source: HIV/AIDS Surveillance Supplemental Report, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (June 2005)

1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Atlanta Eligible Metropolitan Area as defined by Ryan White CARE Act, Title 1, is the equivalent of the Atlanta Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) which is defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Atlanta EMA covered a 20-county area at the time these data were reported: Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Coweta, Forsyth, Paulding, Pickens, Spalding, and Walton, plus the ten counties in the Atlanta Regional Commission jurisdiction (Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Fulton, Gwinnett, Henry and Rockdale).

#### **COST BURDEN**

Basic data on cost burden is provided in Chapter 2 (see Tables 2.16 and 2.17). In addition, data on cost burden are provided in Table 3.14 for owner-occupied units and Table 3.15 for rental units, cross-tabulated by race/ethnicity.

Table 3.14

Monthly Owner Costs as a Percentage of Household Income by Race/Ethnicity, 2000

Specified Owner-Occupied Housing Units

Sandy Springs CDP

Monthly Owner Costs as a	Black		Hispanic or Latino		White	
Percentage of Household Income	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 30% (not cost burdened)	292	78.1%	108	65.1%	10,812	75.2%
30 to 49% (cost burdened)	26	7.0%	34	20.5%	2,005	13.9%
50% or more (severely cost burdened)	50	13.4%	24	14.5%	1,480	10.3%
Not Computed	6	1.6%	0	0%	89	0.6%
Total Housing Units	374	100%	166	100%	14,386	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Table HCT47A, HCT47B, HCT47H.

Table 3.15
Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income by Race/Ethnicity, 2000
Specified Renter-Occupied Housing Units
Sandy Springs CDP

Gross Rent as a	Black		Hispanic or Latino		White	
Percentage of Household Income	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 30% (not cost burdened)	2,103	57.7%	1,144	60.8%	8,834	65.0%
30 to 49% (cost burdened)	853	23.4%	403	21.4%	2,672	19.7%
50% or more (severely cost burdened)	691	18.9%	312	16.6%	2,084	15.3%
Not Computed	80	2.2%	24	1.3%	409	1.3%
Total Housing Units	3,647	100%	1,859	100%	13,590	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Table HCT39A, HCT39B, HCT39H.

Hispanic or Latino households had the highest incidence of cost burden and severe cost burden of the three types of owner-occupied households shown in Table 3.14. Black households had the highest incidence of cost burden and severe cost burden for renter-occupied households, as shown in Table 3.15.

#### **OVERCROWDING**

Statistics for overcrowding are provided in Chapter 2, Table 2.13. As noted in Chapter 2, overcrowding was not an issue for owner-occupied households in Sandy Springs in 2000. However, there were 1,412 renter-occupied units that were overcrowded or severely overcrowded in Sandy Springs in 2000, the majority of which (59.3 percent) were severely overcrowded.

#### **CONDITION**

Housing conditions are addressed in Chapter 2, Table 2.12. In addition, Table 3.16 provides housing conditions data by race/ethnicity. Hispanic or Latino households were more likely to live in housing units lacking complete plumbing facilities in 2000 and were also more likely to be without telephone service, when compared with Black and White households. These data are not available by AMI grouping.

Table 3.16
Condition of Housing Units by Race/Ethnicity, 2000
Sandy Springs CDP

Housing Condition Indicator	Black	Hispanic or Latino	White
Percent Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities	0.5%	1.4%	0.4%
Percent Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%
Percent Without Telephone Service	0.9%	4.0%	0.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. SF3. Tables HCT32A, HCT32B, HCT32H, ACT34A, HCT34B, HCT34H, HCT35A, HCT35B, and HCT35H.

#### **HOMES WITH LEAD-BASED PAINT**

Table 3.17 provides the estimated number of homes with lead-based paint in Sandy Springs in 2000.

Table 3.17
Housing Units with Lead-Based Paint, 2000
Sandy Springs CDP

Year House Built	Total Units	Estimated Number of Units with Lead-Based Paint
Pre-1940	322	290
1940 – 1959	3,005	2,404
1960 – 1979	15,720	9,746
Total	19,047	12,440

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census, SF3, Table H34.

## **SUBSTANCE ABUSE**

Table 3.18 provides regional estimates of substance abuse, which may inform the future consideration of housing needs for substance abusers.

Table 3.18
Estimates of 22 Substance Use Measures in Atlanta 10 County Region (Region 3)

	%	95%
	Estimate	Prediction
		Interval
Any Illicit Drug Use in Past Month	9.29	(7.59 - 11.32)
Any Illicit Drug Use Other Than Marijuana in Past Month	3.88	(3.00 - 5.01)
Marijuana Use in Past Month	6.62	(5.24 - 8.34)
Average Annual Rate of First Use of Marijuana	1.85	(1.50 - 2.29)
Perceptions of Great Risk of Smoking Marijuana Once a Month	39.46	(35.90 - 43.14)
Marijuana Use in Past Year	11.28	(9.47 - 13.40)
Cocaine Use in Past Year	2.36	(1.71 - 3.26)
Nonmedical Use of Pain Relievers in Past Year	4.61	(3.56 - 5.93)
Alcohol Use in Past Month	52.43	(48.70 - 56.13)
Binge Alcohol Use in Past Month	22.09	(19.49 - 24.93)
Perceptions of Great Risk of Having Five or More Drinks of an	45.87	(42.39 - 49.40)
Alcoholic Beverage Once or Twice a Week Perceptions of Great		
Risk of Having Five or More Drinks of an Alcoholic Beverage		
Once or Twice a Week		
Alcohol Use in Past Month among Persons Aged 12 to 20	24.32	(21.02 - 27.95)
Binge Alcohol Use in Past Month among Persons Aged 12 to 20	16.27	(13.57 - 19.38)
Cigarette Use in Past Month	23.82	(21.17 - 26.70)
Any Tobacco Product Use in Past Month	28.33	(25.42 - 31.44)
Perceptions of Great Risk of Smoking One or More Packs of	75.92	(73.19 - 78.46)
Cigarettes Per Day		
Alcohol Dependence in Past Year	3.13	(2.34 - 4.19)
Any Illicit Drug Dependence in Past Year	1.95	(1.42 - 2.67)
Alcohol Dependence or Abuse in Past Year	7.21	(5.91 - 8.77)
Any Illicit Drug Dependence or Abuse in Past Year	2.98	(2.28 - 3.89)
Dependence on or Abuse of Any Illicit Drug or Alcohol in Past Year	9.13	(7.59 - 10.96)
Needing But Not Receiving Treatment for Alcohol Use in Past Year	6.83	(5.57 - 8.36)
Needing But Not Receiving Treatment for Illicit Drug Use in Past	2.62	(2.02 - 3.39)
Year		
Serious Psychological Distress in Past Year	9.92	(7.98 - 12.26)

Source: 2002, 2003, and 2004 National (HHS) Surveys on Drug Use and Health (NSDUHs)

#### PROJECTION OF WORKFORCE HOUSING NEEDS

The Atlanta Regional Commission Regional Development Plan Technical Report, Housing Element (2004 update) notes that regionally, 186,224 affordable housing units were needed as of March 2004 to meet the needs of households making less than \$35,000 per year. It finds further (p. 6-28) that:

"It appears that the housing needs for middle and high income families are being met in the Region versus many low and middle income families that are struggling to pay for adequate housing. The prospects for improvement of this condition in the region are minimal. With increasing populations and absent any major governmental intervention, it appears housing in the Atlanta region will become increasingly unaffordable to more working class families."

Professor Chris Nelson, formerly with Georgia Tech's City and Regional Planning Program, produced a report in 2004 (prepared for the Atlanta Regional Commission) that projects workforce housing needs in the metropolitan Atlanta region by county and Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) areas, including the Sandy Springs LCI. Table 3.19 provides the numbers for Fulton County as a whole, and Table 3.20 provides data for the census tract in Sandy Springs corresponding to the LCI study.

Table 3.19
Projected Workforce Housing Needs
By Range of Household Income, 2000-2030
Fulton County

Household Income Range	2000	2030	Absolute Change in Households, 2000-2030
Less than \$20,000	6,217	10,103	3,885
\$20,001 to \$34,999	137,767	203,539	65,772
\$35,000 to \$49,999	124,220	161,682	37,462
\$50,000 to \$74,999	162,984	205,042	42,059
\$75,000 to \$99,999	58,200	69,206	11,006
\$100,000 or more	48,949	55,360	6,411
Total	538,337	704,933	166,596

Source: "Workforce Housing Balance for the Atlanta Regional Commission: A Spatial Distribution Assessment." March 25, 2004, by Arthur C. Nelson, Ph.D., FAICP.

It should be noted that the methodology for producing the figures in Tables 3.19 and 3.20 used census tract forecasts prepared by the Atlanta Regional Commission and available as of 2004. As noted elsewhere in this technical appendix, projections of households in Sandy Springs, completed as a part of this comprehensive planning effort, are significantly lower than the ARC forecasts. Therefore, it is believed that the projections of workforce housing needs presented in Table 3.20 for Sandy Springs overestimate workforce housing needs. However, it is also important to note that Nelson's forecasts also only coincide with the census tract involved in the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) study for Sandy Springs. Furthermore, it is noted here that the income ranges used in Nelson's report do not correspond with AMI categories or the AMI category proxies used in this Chapter.

Table 3.20
Projected Workforce Housing Needs
By Range of Household Income, 2000-2030
Sandy Springs Livable Center Census Tract

Household Income	2000	2000 % of	2030	2030 % of	Change
Range		Total		Total	
Less than \$20,000	208	1.4%	400	1.7%	192
\$20,001 to \$34,999	4,600	31.9%	7,450	31.3%	2,850
\$35,000 to \$49,999	2,872	19.9%	5,176	21.8%	2,304
\$50,000 to \$74,999	4,221	29.2%	6,423	27.0%	2,202
\$75,000 to \$99,999	1,479	10.3%	2,455	10.3%	976
\$100,000 or more	1,061	7.3%	1,861	7.9%	800
Total	14,441	100%	23,766	100%	9,325

Source: "Workforce Housing Balance for the Atlanta Regional Commission: A Spatial Distribution Assessment." March 25, 2004, by Arthur C. Nelson, Ph.D., FAICP.

With significant adjustments, Nelson's data for the Sandy Springs LCI census tract can be converted to forecasts of housing needs citywide by AMI category for Sandy Springs. First, the percentages of total housing units/households in Nelson's data need to be adjusted to the AMI proxy categories. For instance, since Nelson's first income category includes incomes up to \$20,000, and the extremely low income category only extends to incomes up to \$14,999 (see Table 3.2), one can make a reasonable adjustment by taking 75 percent of the households in Nelson's first category to represent extremely low income. Such adjustments are then made to convert the income ranges used by Nelson to AMI categories. Second, since some of 2000 to 2030 growth of households has already taken place as of 2006, the total "change" of households/housing units shown in Table 3.20 has to be adjusted downward. Third, the total forecasts need to be adjusted downward again to account for a lower projection of households/housing units in Sandy Springs, in order to be consistent with the household and housing unit projections provided in this comprehensive planning effort. The effects of these adjustments are shown in Table 3.21.

Table 3.21 Short-term Projection of Households By AMI Category, 2006-2012 City of Sandy Springs

AMI Category	% of Total Projected Households	2007 House- holds	2012 House- holds	Net Increase, 2007-2012
Extremely Low Income	1.3%	552	559	7
Low Income	9.8%	4,158	4,215	57
Moderate Income	29.2%	12,390	12,558	168
All Target Households	40.3%	17,100	17,332	232
Total Households	100%	42,434	43,007	573

Source: Jerry Weitz & Associates, Inc., October 2006, based on Nelson (2004).

In reviewing the short-term projections in Table 3.21, some explanation is needed. First, if one compares the year 2000 data (see Table 3.2 in this chapter), as of the year 2000 in Sandy Springs the percentage distribution among the AMI categories is quite different from that projected. For instance, whereas extremely low income households comprised 7.6 percent of all households in 2000, they are projected to be only 1.3 percent of the households added in Sandy Springs during the next five years (and to 2030 according to Nelson's data as refined). The percentage of households in the low income (AMI) category is relatively similar in 2000 (7.2 percent, see Table 3.2) and that projected in the short term (9.8 percent, see Table 3.21). Moderate income households comprise a significant higher percentage (29.2 percent) of projected households than existed in 2000 (15.5%). In light of this comparison of year 2000 to the projected income distribution of households, are the projections in Table 3.21 reasonable?

First, Nelson's data are the best available in terms of projecting households by income into the future. Second, given the practical limitations of housing supply in Sandy Springs, it appears reasonable to assume that future AMI target households will have some difficulty finding housing in Sandy Springs; stated differently, due to housing costs the household composition in Sandy Springs will not likely sustain year 2000 conditions. Third, using Nelson's forecasts means that the target households (AMI income ranges) will comprise 40.3 percent of all households in the City, as opposed to only 30.3 percent in the year 2000. Hence, the forecasts should be received as implying a greater percentage of target households than would be the case if year-2000 proportions were used. Fourth, in light of the observation that many future jobs in Sandy Springs will be in the retail trade and services sectors, which yield comparatively lower pay, for purposes of the Consolidated Plan it is reasonable to assume that a higher percentage of new households locating in Sandy Springs will have incomes within the AMI ranges.

#### **PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING**

For a list of non-governmental organizations supporting the housing needs of special populations, see the Atlanta Regional Commission's Regional Development Plan Technical Report, Housing Element, 2004 Update, p. 6-33.

There is a total of 109 public housing units and 325 assisted housing units (as of 2003) in Sandy Springs.

# Allen Road Elderly Midrise (100 units)

144 Allen Rd NE, Sandy Springs, GA 30328 Owner: Fulton County Housing Authority Public housing for elderly and disabled

#### Belle Isle Apartments (9 units)

151 West Belle Isle Rd NE, Sandy Springs, GA 30342 Owner: Fulton County Housing Authority Family public housing complex

#### **Campbell-Stone North Apartments** (200 units)

350 Carpenter Dr NE, Atlanta, GA 30328

Owner: Campbell-Stone North Apartments, Inc. (nonprofit)

Project-based Section 8 assisted housing for elderly (not Housing Choice) (now Housing Choice Vouchers)

The Hellenic Tower (125 units)
8450 Roswell Rd NW, Atlanta, GA 30350
Owner: Greek Orthodox Church
Section 8 assisted housing for elderly (now Housing Choice Vouchers)

#### **HOMELESSNESS**

Fulton County has estimated that 2,100 homeless individuals are in need of specialized housing and supportive living arrangements (Atlanta Regional Commission, Regional Development Plan Technical Report, Housing Element, 2004 Update, p. 6-35.). ARC's technical report (2004) on housing, citing the Task Force for the Homeless and its report "Homelessness in Metropolitan Atlanta," finds:

"...over the next 10 year period, almost 60,000 shelter beds will be needed based on their calculation of roughly 50,000 individuals who were homeless in 2000. Although there are many resources available in the inner core of the Region, the demand overwhelms those resources. Homeless individuals located in the outer counties are not as obvious but are abundant enough to strain the caregiving agencies now in place. In these counties, there are few beds for general populations, families, women with children, battered women, mentally ill persons who are homeless and those with HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, or other debilitating diseases."

Data specific to Sandy Springs are not currently available, though a survey of homeless in Sandy Springs is programmed to occur in collaboration with the Pathways Community Network in January 2007. In the interim, until more specific data are made available, Sandy Springs should consider itself somewhere in between the "inner core" of the region and the "outer counties" referenced in the report above. Sandy Springs may be served by some of the existing resources within Fulton County, though they probably serve primarily the City of Atlanta. The next section provides information on inventories of facilities serving the homeless.

#### **HOMELESS AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE FACILITIES**

The following facilities have been identified in the Sandy Springs area as providing some form of homeless or housing assistance. A total of 2,700 shelter beds were available in the metro Atlanta region as of 2004 (p. 6-34). For a listing of agencies and groups that serve homeless needs in the Atlanta region, see Atlanta Regional Commission, Regional Development Plan Technical Report, Housing Element (2004 Update), p. 6-35.

Community Action Center, Inc. 1130 Hightower Trail, Sandy Springs, GA 30350 CAC30328@aol.com, 770-552-4889

The Community Action Center offers emergency assistance to families in need, including financial, food, clothing and referrals. The CAC unites community efforts in responding to requests for emergency assistance. Resources are donated by 19 area churches and synagogues, individuals, organizations, schools and businesses. The CAC serves persons of all ages who have experienced a sudden change in life/economic circumstances and live within the five zip codes of Sandy Springs and Dunwoody (30327, 30328, 30338, 30342 & 30350).

The Drake House 10500 Clara Drive, Roswell, GA 30075 http://www.thedrakehouse.org/ 770-587-4712

The Drake House provides 15 transitional housing units for up to 90 days to homeless single mothers with one or more children. The coverage area is north Fulton County, and a single mother has to be either employed or employable. A major goal of the Drake House is to allow the service users to concentrate on savings during the stay for initial housing payments such as first month deposit and utility installation or connection charges. The Drake House also provides life skills classes such as job readiness, personal finances, parenting skills, computer skills, and health and wellness.

HomeStretch 89 Grove Way, Roswell, GA 30075 http://www.homestretch.org/ 700-642-9185

HomeStretch provides 27 transitional housing units for nine to twelve months to a homeless family or a family immediately threatened with being homeless with children. A family does not necessarily need to be a single-mother family. The coverage area is north Fulton County, and a householder should be either employed or employable. A family pays rent based on a sliding scale based on their adjusted gross household income. HomeStretch also provides life skills classes. If a family needs additional time to regain self-sufficiency after the stay, HomeStretch may provide the family an open-ended, long-term HomeStretch affordable housing program.

Mary Hall Freedom House 200 Hannover Park Road Suite 100, GA Sandy Springs 30350 http://www.maryhallfreedomhouse.org/ 770-642-5500

Mary Hall Freedom House provides transitional housing units along with substance abuse treatment for women and women with children. A major goal is to break the cycle of addiction and homelessness this population. Services also include treatment of alcohol, substance, physical, and mental and/or emotional abuse.

Sandy Springs Mission 4577 Roswell Rd, Sandy Springs, GA 30342 http://sandyspringsmission.org/ 404-943-1540

Sandy Springs Mission provides after-school programs and food/clothing assistance.

Sandy Springs United Methodist Church 86 Mount Vernon Hwy, Sandy Springs, GA 30328 http://www.ssumc.org/ 404-255-1181

This church provides clothing to persons in need and community meals bimonthly.

#### OTHER (SPECIAL) HOUSING NEEDS

This section describes other (special) housing needs, although data specific to the city and region are not currently available.

# **Housing Accessible to Persons with Disabilities**

Many Americans are living in homes that are not designed for people with disabilities. The increasing numbers of people with disabilities brought on by the increase in the number of seniors will likely worsen this situation. New homes continue to be built with basic barriers to use by the disabled, and this is unfortunate given how easy it is to build basic access in the great majority of new homes. One solution to the quandaries described above is a form of accessible housing design known as "visitability." Visitability calls for all new homes (both single-family and multi-family) to be designed and built with basic level access. As the name suggests, a primary purpose of this design is to allow people with disabilities to independently access the homes of their non-disabled peers. The design also allows the non-disabled to continue residing in their homes should they develop a disability (Casselman 2004).<sup>2</sup>

#### Deinstitutionalization

People with mental illnesses and other disabilities are often released from institutions with nowhere to go. Land use regulations and neighborhood resistance can pose barriers to the development of congregate living facilities and other arrangements to house such persons.

#### REGULATORY BARRIERS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING

It is important to recognize that housing costs can be influenced by local land use regulations, building requirements, and other local policies. The following paragraphs describe generally how various regulatory mechanisms can affect the cost and affordability of housing. For additional information on barriers to affordable housing, see "Workforce Housing Balance for the Atlanta Regional Commission: A Spatial Distribution Assessment," March 25, 2004, by Arthur C. Nelson, as well as p. 6-29 of the Atlanta Regional Commission, Regional Development Plan Technical Report, Housing Element.

#### **Housing and Building Codes**

One of the primary objectives of a housing code is to ensure minimum standards for habitable dwellings and to prevent the deterioration of housing quality. A housing code requires certain facilities (sanitary, water supply, heating, cooking, etc.) to be in every dwelling unit. Such codes also usually establish minimum dwelling space requirements (e.g., 150 square feet for the first occupant and 100 square feet for each additional occupant) and provisions for the upkeep of home exteriors (walls, doors, windows, etc.). Under such a code, the housing official can designate dwellings as dangerous or unfit for human occupancy, and, if necessary, condemn dangerous or unfit dwellings. Building codes specify minimum standards for construction materials and construction practices when building dwellings, which can also affect cost.

#### **Zoning Ordinance**

The location of residential development is governed by use restrictions established by zoning districts. The definition of "family" in the zoning ordinance usually addresses the maximum number of unrelated persons living together in a single-family unit. The permitted uses sections of the zoning ordinance either allow or do not allow certain types of housing units. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Casselman, Joel. 2004. Visitability: A New Direction for Changing Demographics. *Practicing Planner*, 2, 4.

minimum size of individual housing units is sometimes specified by minimum floor area requirements in the zoning code. Minimum lot sizes and maximum densities establish how many housing units can be built on a given piece of property. Density restrictions influence both the supply of housing as well as the cost per unit of land (White 1992).<sup>3</sup> Minimum lot widths require certain amounts of street frontage for detached dwellings on individual lots.

# **Subdivision Regulations**

Subdivision ordinances establish standards for streets, drainage, utilities, and other improvements within subdivisions. The layout of blocks and lots is also guided by standards in the subdivision ordinance. Subdivision standards affect the cost of land for development and, therefore, indirectly affect the total costs of housing built on individual lots subject to that ordinance. Approximately 25 percent of housing costs are attributable to land costs in most real estate markets (White 1992).

#### **Development Impact Fees**

The City does not currently charge development impact fees for roads, recreation and parks, public safety and fire, or other eligible facilities, but as a part of this comprehensive planning process it intends to prepare and adopt development impact fees. To the extent that developers and builders can pass on to consumers the extra costs of development impact fees, impact fees increase the costs of housing. There is not a consensus, however, among economists that impact fee burdens are shifted forward to the consumer in the form of increased housing costs. Impact fees can create unintended disincentives for the production of affordable housing (White 1992). Georgia's development impact fee law allows local governments to exempt affordable housing from impact fees, provided that the money that would be collected as an impact fee be made up through some other funding source. Such exemptions must be tied to the City's goals and objectives for producing low- and moderate-income housing.

#### **Manufactured Housing**

Fulton County has had a long history of restricting the location of mobile and manufactured homes. Exclusion of manufactured homes has been questioned before in Georgia but is considered acceptable in the courts. In a case decided March 10, 2003, by the Georgia Supreme Court (*King v City of Bainbridge*), the City prevailed against a challenge that its zoning regulations were unconstitutional. The *King* decision overruled the longstanding legal precedent established in *Cannon v Coweta County* (a 1990 Georgia Supreme Court decision) that posed more restrictive legal boundaries for local zoning ordinances. Manufactured homes are often less expensive than traditional stick-built homes of comparable size, and while possible sites for their location in the City are limited, this housing is a permitted type in the City's zoning ordinance.

The Federal Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards went into effect June 15, 1976 (24 CFR 3280, Revised as of April 1, 2001). Manufactured homes have become safer and more durable since the enactment of the HUD Code in 1976, and their appearance has improved significantly (American Planning Association 2001). The HUD code preempts state

<sup>3</sup> White, S. Mark. 1992. *Affordable Housing: Proactive & Reactive Strategies*. Planning Advisory Service Report No. 441. Chicago: American Planning Association.

and local building code approval by state and local governments, but it does not preempt local governments from adopting and enforcement placement and set-up restrictions (Weitz 2004). 4

<sup>4</sup> Weitz, Jerry. 2004. "Manufactured Housing: Trends and Issues in the 'Wheel Estate' Industry." *Practicing Planner*, Vol. 2, No. 4.